

Gregory F. Smith

JUN 2 1 2016

Norfolk, Virginia 23508

RE:

MUR 6813

Gregory F. Smith

Dear Mr. Smith:

On May 1, 2014, the Federal Election Commission notified you of a complaint alleging violations of certain sections of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (the "Act"). A copy of the complaint was forwarded to you at that time.

Upon further review of the allegations contained in the complaint, and information supplied by you, the Commission, on June 16, 2016, voted to dismiss this matter. The Factual and Legal Analysis, which more fully explains the Commission's decision, is enclosed for your information.

Documents related to the case will be placed on the public record within 30 days. See Statement of Policy Regarding Disclosure of Closed Enforcement and Related Files, 68 Fed. Reg. 70,426 (Dec. 18, 2003) and Statement of Policy Regarding Placing First General Counsel's Reports on the Public Record, 74 Fed. Reg. 66,132 (Dec. 14, 2009).

If you have any questions, please contact Elena Paoli, the attorney assigned to this matter, at (202) 694-1650.

Sincerely

Deff S. Jordan

Assistant General Counsel Complaints Examination

& Legal Administration

Enclosure

Factual and Legal Analysis

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS

2 RESPONDENTS: 4

RESPONDENTS: Cox for Congress and David Cox as treasurer

MUR 6813

as treasures
David Cox

Gregory F. Smith

I. INTRODUCTION

This matter was generated by a complaint alleging violations of the Federal Election

Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (the "Act") and Commission regulations by Cox for

Congress and David Cox as treasurer, David Cox, and Gregory F. Smith. It was scored as a lowrated matter under the Enforcement Priority System, by which the Commission uses formal
scoring criteria as a basis to allocate its resources and decide which matters to pursue.

II. FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS

A. Factual Background

Complainant Elvira F. Hasty alleges that Smith made and the Committee accepted excessive contributions during the 2014 election cycle. Compl. at 1-2. The complainant also alleges that the Committee improperly reported a \$3,000 contribution from Smith as a loan, and that Smith's corporation, Smith, Powell and Associates, made a \$2,000 prohibited contribution to the Committee. *Id.* Finally, the Complainant alleges that Smith's name is spelled differently in several disclosure reports, possibly to avoid detection of his excessive contributions. *Id.* at 2. Complainant bases her allegations on information contained in the Committee's disclosure reports as follows:

2

4

5

CONTRIBUTOR	DATE	AMOUNT	ELECTION	REPORT AND NOTES
Gregory Smith	5/22/13	\$500	Primary	Original 2013 July Quarterly and Amended 2013 July Quarterly (5/15/14)
Gregory Smith	6/20/13	\$3,000	Primary	Same; contribution also identified on Schedule C as a loan
Greg Smith	7/12/13	\$500	Primary	Original 2013 October Quarterly; Amended 2013 October Quarterly (5/15/14) shows contributor as "Greggory Smith;" \$3,000 "loan" from prior report not carried over
Greg Smith	9/28/13	\$500	Primary	Same
Gregg Smith	12/6/13	\$500	Primary	Original 2013 Year End Report; Amended 2013 Year End (5/15/14) changed name to "Greggory Smith;"
Smith, Powell, and Associates	12/5/13	\$500	Primary	Original 2013 Year End and Amended 2013 Year End
Smith, Powell, and Associates	12/13/13	\$1,500	Primary	Same
Gregg Smith	1/30/14	\$500	Primary	April 2014 Quarterly Report

The Complainant alleges that Smith's individual contributions exceeded the maximum

individual contribution limit, which, even if the contributions were designated to both the

primary and general elections. Id. at 1. The Complainant further alleges that Smith's

Dismissal and Case Closure — MUR 6813 Factual and Legal Analysis Cox for Congress et al. Page 3

1 corporation is comprised of two partners, and thus half of its \$2,000 contribution should be

2 attributable to Smith, thereby further increasing his excessive contribution. *Id.* at 2.

Cox and the Committee responded that Cox and his "team" "immediately" began auditing the Committee's filings and amending any mistakes. Cox Resp. at 1. Cox also said he intended to amend the filings for name consistency and return any excessive funds. *Id.* Cox stated that he was a first-time candidate and did not act intentionally. *Id.*

Smith responded that he was unaware of campaign contribution limits. Smith Resp. at 1. He said that he understood that the Committee would be refunding him \$3,000. *Id.* He also said that Smith, Powell and Associates is his franchise and that he is its sole proprietor. *Id.*

B. Legal Analysis

During the 2014 election cycle, the individual contribution limit was \$2,600 to any candidate or his or her authorized committee per election. 52 U.S.C. § 30116(a)(1)(A). The term "contribution" includes loans. 52 U.S.C. § 30101(8)(A)(i). Political committees may accept contributions from partnerships and certain LLCs. See 11 C.F.R. §§ 110.1(e) (partnership contributions), 110.1(g) (LLC contributions). Political committees may also accept contributions from sole proprietorships, so long as the sole proprietor is permitted to make a contribution under the Act. See Advisory Op. 1980-89 (Coelho) at 2 (a contribution by a sole proprietorship is treated as a contribution by the individual who is the sole proprietor of the business); Advisory Op. 1989-21 (Create-a-Craft) at 2 (sole proprietors are subject to the limitations concerning excessive, as opposed to prohibited, contributions).

Smith, while using one of the various first names of Greg, Gregg, Gregory, or Greggory, contributed a total of \$5,500 to the Committee, all designated for the primary election, including a \$3,000 "loan." Because Smith did not make any general election contributions, \$2,600 of his

Dismissal and Case Closure — MUR 6813 Factual and Legal Analysis Cox for Congress et al. Page 4

- \$5,500 total contribution could have been redesignated for the general. It appears, however, that
- 2 the Committee did not follow the proper procedures in order to timely seek redesignation of the
- 3 primary contributions. See 11 C.F.R. § 110.1(b)(5)(ii)(B)(5).
- In addition, the sole proprietorship of Smith, Powell, and Associates contributed \$2,000
- 5 to the Committee. Since Smith is the sole proprietor of Smith, Powell, the \$2,000 contribution is
- 6 also attributed to Smith. Thus, Smith contributed a total of \$7,500 in primary contributions to
- 7 the Committee. In the absence of any resdesignation, Smith exceeded the contribution limits for
- 8 the primary election by \$4,900. The Committee appears to have refunded \$300 to Smith on June
- 9 29, 2014, which still leaves \$4,600 in unrefunded primary contributions that exceed the per
- 10 election limitation. 52 U.S.C. § 30116(a)(1)(A).
- Therefore, Gregory F. Smith violated 52 U.S.C. § 30116(a)(1)(A) by making excessive
- 12 contributions, and Cox for Congress violated 52 U.S.C. § 30116(f) by accepting excessive
- contributions. The Committee also appears to have misreported a \$3,000 contribution by Smith
- as a loan in its original and amended 2013 July Quarterly Reports.²
- In light of the amounts at issue, the fact that the candidate was a first-time candidate and
- the contributor was not an experienced contributor.³ and the Committee's request to terminate,
- the Commission exercises its prosecutorial discretion, pursuant to *Heckler v. Chaney*, 470 U.S.
- 18 821 (1985), and dismisses this matter as to Cox for Congress and David Cox in his official
- capacity as treasurer, David Cox, and Gregory F. Smith. Additionally, the Commission reminds

The notice to the contributor regarding redesignation must be sent within 60 days of the receipt of the contribution. Otherwise, the excessive contribution must be refunded. 11 C.F.R. § 110.1(b)(5)(ii)(B).

Although Cox said in his and the Committee's Response that he would filed amended reports to correct name consistency and refund any excessive contributions, the Committee's amended reports do not show such actions, except for a \$300 refund.

According to Commission records, Smith made one prior federal contribution in 2008 for \$1,000.

Dismissal and Case Closure — MUR 6813 Factual and Legal Analysis Cox for Congress et al. Page 5

- 1 the Committee to refund the excessive contributions to Gregory F. Smith and file amended
- 2 disclosure reports to reflect such activity.